

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FORMER NEBRASKA ORDNANCE PLANT

RESTORATION ADVISOR BOARD

BOARD MEETING

HELD IN MEAD, NEBRASKA

DATE: APRIL 6, 2006

TIME: 6:00 P.M.

Reported by Cynthia A. Craig
Videographed by John Thomas

1 GARTH ANDERSON: Good evening everybody.
2 Welcome to the Mead Restoration Advisory Board
3 Meeting. I appreciate everyone coming out in spite
4 of the threatening weather. I'm Garth Anderson and
5 I'm the Corps of Engineer's project manager for the
6 Mead site.

7 Before I get started because of the
8 threatening weather I guess we've already kind of
9 thought about what happens if tornado sirens go off.
10 This is something I've never had to do before at a
11 RAB meeting, but it wasn't on the agenda but I think
12 it's important enough to cover.

13 What I've been told by those folks that
14 live in Mead, that the best place to go -- this
15 probably isn't the best building to be in, a big
16 steel building with a big sheet metal building next
17 to us, apparently a block that way is a --

18 Brady, where -- block that way, a block
19 over, the church?

20 BRADY BIGELOW: Down one block -- go to
21 the stop sign, down one block to --

22 GARTH ANDERSON: Follow him, hopefully the
23 doors are open when we get there.

24 All right. Well, without further ado
25 let's go ahead and get started, a couple of

1 administrative announcements.

2 Tonight we actually figured out how to get
3 the coffee pot to work, so we do have coffee,
4 cookies; help yourself, and maybe it'll make the
5 evening a little more pleasant.

6 There are handouts in the back as you came
7 in. If you did not sign in I'd really appreciate it
8 if you could sign in because we like to see who all
9 comes to these, and if you want to get added to our
10 mailing list we can do that too. There are copies
11 of our presentation slides back there and some other
12 items.

13 VIDEOGRAPHER: Remember me and the court
14 reporter.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes, we'll get there,
16 wouldn't forget you.

17 This is our agenda for tonight and I'll
18 get some introductions too. You know, review the
19 agenda, look at some items that we -- things we've
20 done since the last meeting.

21 We're going to talk about groundwater
22 monitoring; it's a big topic of interest, and we'll
23 get into that in some detail. We'll talk about the
24 next RAB meeting, and, of course, we're always open
25 to questions and answers.

1 Introductions, our community co-chair,
2 Ms. Melissa Konecky, is in back, you can wave. I
3 think everybody probably knows you already.

4 Again, I'm Garth Anderson, the Army
5 co-chair, and other board members, first we have
6 Scott Marquess from EPA Region 7, Mr. Larry Angle
7 from the Lower Platte Natural Resource District, and
8 a couple other Corps employees that are here
9 tonight. We have Mary Lyle, one of the project
10 engineers on the project, and Cathi Sanders, our
11 environmental attorney.

12 Did I miss anybody, Scott?

13 SCOTT MARQUESS: Alyse Stoy.

14 GARTH ANDERSON: Yeah, Alyse Stoy, EPA
15 Region 7 attorney.

16 Okay. Some of the meeting guidelines just
17 to help the meeting run a little bit better, again
18 we -- it's public participation, we like to answer
19 questions. We'll stand up here as long as anybody
20 wants to.

21 Because of the weather we don't want to
22 linger too long so we're going to try to end on
23 time, stick to the agenda. Let's try to keep it to
24 one question at a time just so we can fully answer
25 everybody's question.

1 Slide.

2 Here's the kicker: Meetings are being
3 recorded. If you don't want to be on the DVD of
4 this meeting then you might have to hide your face
5 or something, but we have it recorded on DVD and we
6 also have a transcriptionist that will provide a
7 written transcript of the meeting.

8 Both of these items will be placed on
9 the -- the transcript will be placed on the web site
10 once it's complete, and the transcript with the DVD
11 will be placed in the Mead Public Library.

12 LYNN MOORER: When will that happen?

13 GARTH ANDERSON: A typical turnaround is
14 usually --

15 COURT REPORTER: Two, three weeks.

16 GARTH ANDERSON: About a month because we
17 get it from the transcriptionist, and then we do
18 some quality control on it to make sure all the
19 names and terms and everything is correct, and then
20 we'll make the corrections and then post it.

21 LYNN MOORER: I'm Lynn Moorner,
22 M-O-O-R-E-R.

23 Mr. Anderson, how many of the DVDs are in
24 the library now as you have said they are?

25 GARTH ANDERSON: Just one copy right now.

1 LYNN MOORER: And those were placed there
2 when?

3 GARTH ANDERSON: Mr. Bigelow, those were,
4 what, two weeks ago?

5 BRADY BIGELOW: We Fed Ex them over, but
6 it gets held for a while. I'm going up tomorrow to
7 check to make sure everything we've Fed Ex'd has
8 made it in, but I can't -- I don't know if it's made
9 it onto the shelf yet.

10 MELISSA KONECKY: I don't think they've
11 made it -- anything has made it into the library
12 yet, as of Monday they haven't.

13 BRADY BIGELOW: Yeah, when we Fed Ex
14 them up, sometimes it takes a little while because
15 they're not open every day, sometimes it takes them
16 a little while for them to get put on the shelf.

17 LYNN MOORER: So the record needs to
18 reflect they're not actually there. What you're
19 saying isn't actually true yet. We appreciate -- we
20 look forward to them being there, but we've been
21 looking forward to them for weeks and weeks and
22 weeks, and there's still nothing there.

23 BRADY BIGELOW: I'll check tomorrow.

24 GARTH ANDERSON: We'll confirm.

25 And if you do have a question in the back

1 we do have someone that's running a microphone, it's
2 Lisa Tholl, she's from URS, one of our contractors
3 working on the site.

4 Slide.

5 Mailing list, for those of you that would
6 like to get direct mail from the Corps of Engineers,
7 you can put your address on the sign-in sheet.
8 Again, it's -- we can't guarantee total privacy
9 because the information is -- becomes somewhat
10 public, so if you're sensitive to that then there
11 are other means for us to disseminate information to
12 you.

13 Slide.

14 And we do have a project web site, it's
15 getting better all the time. We've -- we've been
16 posting things as we get it as quickly as we can
17 after we've checked it out to make sure it's
18 accurate.

19 And also an e-mail list, I've been
20 compiling an e-mail list of whoever's provided me
21 their address, and when I -- when I send things out
22 I do the mass e-mail mailing list to whoever has
23 provided me their address.

24 One other feature I would like to point
25 out is Mr. Brady Bigelow from our contractor ECC,

1 he is here with the project database, and he has the
2 capability tonight if you have any specific data
3 questions on monitoring, sampling, anything that's
4 been collected on site, he can run the query and
5 we'll be able to provide you an answer on that
6 tonight.

7 Okay. All right. Without further ado
8 let's move on with the actual presentation. Okay.

9 First, we're going to go through this --
10 let me just run through this. Status update, we're
11 going to talk about -- we've already covered this,
12 let's go on.

13 Status update, what have we done since the
14 last regular RAB meeting, which was the 1st of
15 December 2005? A lot of work has been done on
16 groundwater monitoring, and that's really our
17 featured topic for tonight, and Mary Lyle will walk
18 us through that later on tonight.

19 And I would like to point out one other
20 thing about our monitoring. If after the meeting
21 you have questions, we have maps available posted on
22 the walls of our third quarter sampling, which was
23 done in September; our fourth quarter sampling,
24 which was done in December; and we have our
25 2006 groundwater monitoring program laid out in the

1 back so you can see what the well sampling frequency
2 and surface water sample frequency is going to be,
3 and we have it broken down by each of the four
4 sampling events.

5 Okay. Load Line 1, we've done a lot of
6 work on Load Line 1 for those of you that are not
7 familiar with where Load Line 1 is. This -- this is
8 what we refer to as Load Line 1.

9 As we've been talking about in previous
10 meetings, we've -- could we get that door closed,
11 please? I think we're going to -- hold on.

12 Since our last RAB meeting, the
13 Extraction Well 12 and 13 at the southern end of
14 Load Line 1 plume have been installed, and we have
15 commenced full-scale operations, especially on
16 load -- on Extraction Well 12. 13 is not scheduled
17 to start pumping for another year or so yet, but
18 Extraction Well 12 is operational.

19 The air stripper stand-alone treatment
20 system is operational, and we've done the start-up
21 testing and sampling and other things, so it is
22 operational at this point.

23 Part of that -- part of the start-up
24 operation also included doing some direct push
25 sampling just south. There's a small bit of

1 contamination just south of the extraction wells,
2 but still in the radius of influence of the
3 extraction well, right -- right down here, and we've
4 done extensive sampling through here and south of
5 that just to make sure that we have that -- that,
6 you know, complete picture of what is the southern
7 end of that plume.

8 The start-up data -- the start-up data is
9 in a handout in the back. It's a one-sheet table
10 that you can look at, and it's also been posted on
11 our web site.

12 Okay. Next item, the eastern plume,
13 that's an area that's near and dear to everyone's
14 heart, the one that most of us are concerned about.

15 When we -- when we met last, I'll point
16 here and I'm going to probably go over to those maps
17 over there. It may be difficult to brief from back
18 there, but, again, because of the detail of the maps
19 I'd be happy to -- you know, after the meeting if
20 anybody doesn't get a clear picture of what we're
21 doing there, then we'll stay as long as anybody
22 wants to be able to explain that.

23 As we talked about in our December
24 meeting, we did a series of direct push transects
25 across this plume, the purpose of which was to

1 refine and get a -- gain even more confidence in
2 what that edge of the plume looks like.

3 And as we briefed in December from our
4 sampling that we had done in October, that so far
5 our sampling shows that -- it really raised our
6 confidence a lot. I love briefing this part of it,
7 really raised our confidence that the pictures that
8 we've been drawing of the edge of the plume is
9 pretty accurate.

10 But we weren't completely satisfied with
11 just that -- that phase of sampling. That first
12 phrase not only did raise our confidence, but it
13 also provided us additional information so that we
14 could go back and take additional transects.

15 Let me go over here just to kind of show
16 you. It may be hard to catch this on camera, I
17 apologize, but I would like to point out, you can
18 come here after the meeting or during a break or
19 something to show exactly where all these transects
20 are that we 've pushed across the plume so you can
21 get an idea of the spacing between sampling points
22 and between the crosscut of the plume.

23 Now, there's a -- we're collecting a lot
24 of data and not only across and down but each of the
25 sampling points also goes to three depths, so that

1 when we're done we'll have a very confident picture
2 of what that eastern plume looks like, both at the
3 extent and the depth, and when we -- we issue our
4 report on the data sometime around June, we'll
5 even -- we're going to experiment with even
6 depicting it with some cutaway views of what the
7 plume might look like in depth. It just gives us a
8 better picture of what -- what it would look like.

9 CHRIS FUNK: How far down do those lines
10 go?

11 GARTH ANDERSON: We went -- it's kind of
12 hard to see on this map, but we've taken transects
13 all the way down to the end of the plume and even --
14 I'll come over here.

15 CHRIS FUNK: South of EW-1?

16 GARTH ANDERSON: Right. We've even gone
17 south of EW-1 to here, so we've done them here and
18 all the way up the plume like that.

19 LYNN MOORER: How far south?

20 GARTH ANDERSON: Lisa, what's our furthest
21 southern transect precisely?

22 LISA THOLL: Lisa Tholl, URS, I'd say it's
23 probably --

24 GARTH ANDERSON: Tell me when to stop.

25 LISA THOLL: Keep going, about right

1 there.

2 SCOTT MARQUESS: Is that County Road F?

3 GARTH ANDERSON: That is -- yeah, that's
4 County Road F, and right now we are in the middle of
5 doing our Phase 2 sampling.

6 It's looking kind of grim for doing any
7 sampling tomorrow because the fields might be just a
8 bit muddy, but -- and we appreciate everyone's
9 cooperation in allowing us access to your property
10 so that we can collect this valuable information.

11 One of the other products that will come
12 out of this now that we have a good, confident
13 picture of the plume is this will help us to put --
14 install new monitoring wells along the eastern side
15 of the plume so that we can not only know where the
16 plume is, but we'll have a monitoring system in
17 place to make sure that nothing does move, or if it
18 does move, which we don't believe it will, that we
19 would know about it very early in the process.

20 And, again, we appreciate everyone's
21 cooperation in allowing us onto their property, and
22 we're working as hard as we can to get finished
23 before any planting starts.

24 What other activities, we had a special
25 RAB meeting on March 23rd, just two weeks ago, to

1 talk about groundwater modeling; we had a good
2 turnout for that.

3 Containment evaluation, what is this, it's
4 our work plan to -- to better evaluate how
5 successful our groundwater containment system is.
6 We're proposing a methodology to EPA and to NDEQ,
7 how to best measure the effectiveness of the
8 containment system.

9 When we talk about the containment
10 systems, it's all the extraction wells tied in with
11 the treatment plant designed to keep this plume from
12 getting any larger, because that's our first order
13 of business is to keep the plume where it is.

14 But in order to determine how successful
15 we are, we have to do a lot of -- we have to come up
16 with lots of different ways to measure the
17 effectiveness of the system both through hydraulics;
18 in other words, looking at groundwater levels to
19 find out how effective our pumping is in capturing
20 the plume; we use other information of contamination
21 or sampling monitoring wells to make sure that the
22 contamination has not spread, we use groundwater
23 modeling to do predictions and to see how well the
24 real world correlates to our groundwater model.

25 There are a number of factors that go into

1 the -- into the containment evaluation plan to
2 determine how successful we are.

3 An important element of the containment
4 evaluation work plan is the so-what question, okay.
5 We -- if we take measurements and based on our
6 criteria determine that we're out of containment
7 what do we do then? Just measuring it doesn't do
8 you any good unless you have some kind of response
9 action.

10 So we were also going to be proposing some
11 general response actions to what happens if the
12 plume does go out of containment, which we don't
13 believe it will because we have a pretty high level
14 of confidence, but we don't like to dismiss it; we
15 want to ensure that things are in place and thought
16 of if some type of contingency arises, how would we
17 respond to that.

18 MELISSA KONECKY: Garth, have you guys
19 ever agreed on a definition of containment?

20 GARTH ANDERSON: That's part of this plan.
21 The work plan that we have submitted to EPA and NDEQ
22 outlines what we think are the criteria for
23 maintaining containment.

24 EPA and DEQ are reviewing that plan, and
25 they'll provide our comments and we'll sit down and

1 continue to work out what those -- what those
2 criteria and what those factors are for successful
3 containment.

4 MELISSA KONECKY: Because it just seems
5 that either it would be in containment or not. I
6 mean, do you have a definition?

7 GARTH ANDERSON: I wish there was a simple
8 definition, but there are we what call multiple
9 lines of data, multiple lines of information that
10 determine when you're in containment.

11 As I mentioned before, we have -- we have
12 the hydraulics of the groundwater, we have the
13 measurement of the actual contamination to make sure
14 it's not moving, and other factors.

15 LYNN MOORER: Mr. Anderson?

16 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

17 LYNN MOORER: I have one more follow-up
18 question. Lynn Moorner again.

19 You issued a containment evaluation work
20 plan in March.

21 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

22 LYNN MOORER: I note that Mr. Marquess
23 sent you a message after receiving that and
24 indicated -- I had understood based -- well, quote,
25 I had understood based upon our discussions that the

1 work plan would include some sort of working
2 definition of, quote, containment, closed quote,
3 much like we have been pondering for defining,
4 quote, impact, closed quote. I haven't come across
5 a definition of containment in the work plan; is it
6 included?

7 Did you get an answer to your question,
8 Mr. Marquess? Is there a working definition in the
9 work plan is the second question?

10 SCOTT MARQUESS: Just to give a little
11 context, I sent that message -- I had not reviewed
12 the plan yet, so that was my first reading, first
13 blush at what I had seen or glanced at.

14 I would say we provided comments to the
15 Corps this week, and this week I sent comments to
16 the comprehensive review of the work plan, and, you
17 know, there are things in our estimation that will
18 need to be revised in the plan to make it
19 satisfactory in terms of the working definition of
20 containment or however we're going to evaluate the
21 performance of the remediation system.

22 LYNN MOORER: So to reiterate my question,
23 is there a working definition of containment at this
24 point?

25 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, there's not a final

1 document at this point, so there's a document that's
2 in review that we've offered comments and
3 suggestions and things that we think need to be
4 revised in order to make the containment evaluation
5 work plan more complete or to our satisfaction.

6 LYNN MOORER: Would you be so kind as to
7 summarize for us or paraphrase for us where the
8 working -- what the working definition of
9 containment is right now?

10 SCOTT MARQUESS: I really -- I don't know
11 that I could do an adequate job of that. I can tell
12 you --

13 LYNN MOORER: Well, could someone from the
14 Corps do that?

15 SCOTT MARQUESS: One thing I can tell you
16 that the ROD addresses -- and Garth talked about
17 multiple lines of evidence.

18 Well, I mean, the way we would look at
19 containment would include a chemical monitoring
20 component, which is, you know, the outline of the
21 plume based on remediation goals that have been
22 established, a chemical and a hydraulic component.

23 The chemical is pretty straightforward,
24 and I think the ROD defines it to some extent, that
25 the plume is -- the ROD says the plume -- the goal

1 of the hydraulic containment system is that the
2 plume not move from its ROD depicted boundaries.

3 So that's one important thing, that's --
4 and that's pretty easy to -- relatively easy to
5 assess cut and dry; is the line -- or is -- is
6 contamination beyond the line above our remediation
7 level.

8 LYNN MOORER: Say --

9 SCOTT MARQUESS: Does contamination exist
10 beyond the ROD depicted boundaries at levels
11 exceeding our remediation goals; 5 for TC and 2 for
12 RDX, so that's one working definition that we would
13 want to see specified that we're going to evaluate
14 the performance of the remedy relative to that.

15 Everything else in terms of hydraulics
16 gets a lot more complicated, and I don't really feel
17 I'm very capable of describing it in detail.

18 LYNN MOORER: Is there somebody from the
19 Corps who wants to jump in since it's your plan?

20 GARTH ANDERSON: We didn't come prepared
21 to talk about the containment evaluation work plan
22 tonight, so not tonight, but it's certainly a great
23 topic for a future RAB meeting.

24 LYNN MOORER: We'd appreciate you
25 following up as you promise to do after each meeting

1 to respond to the unanswered questions, so we would
2 like to have that responded to specifically.

3 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay. Let me --

4 LYNN MOORER: Thank you.

5 GARTH ANDERSON: Cathi, can you write that
6 up on the flip chart, please, make sure -- that
7 green box has -- right here.

8 We will certainly do that, and as we work
9 out the agenda for the next RAB meeting that sounds
10 like it could be a good topic, but we'll obviously
11 figure that out.

12 LINDA WAGEMAN: Garth, I've got a
13 question.

14 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

15 LINDA WAGEMAN: This is Linda Wageman.

16 There are 1,249 superfund sites
17 specifically containing groundwater. I don't
18 understand, help me to understand why we don't have
19 a definition of containment.

20 This seems -- I mean, this is something
21 that the Corps has been doing for a million years;
22 defining groundwater containment in conjunction with
23 superfund sites is not new.

24 So why is it that when we or another
25 regulator asks for a definition, I would think that

1 that definition would have been laid out
2 specifically. Help me to understand why there was
3 no definition for a containment because --

4 GARTH ANDERSON: That's a fair question.
5 We have had working definitions of containment.
6 We've been working with principally the -- doing the
7 chemical monitoring along the south. Do we find
8 anything south or east or anywhere else around the
9 plume; if the containment hasn't spread that's a
10 good working definition.

11 What we're attempting to do with this
12 containment evaluation work plan is improve not only
13 our definition of containment but to have more --
14 have better ways of measuring and grading our -- our
15 containment.

16 LINDA WAGEMAN: So basically then what
17 you're stating is the definition of containment
18 isn't necessarily the issue; it's the measurement of
19 the containment or the measurement to define what --
20 what those containment perimeters are; is that
21 correct?

22 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

23 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay. So if we know that
24 in the ROD, the way the plume is sitting right now,
25 it is not in containment in accordance with the ROD

1 because the plume has moved outside of 5 and 2, so
2 we know that in accordance with the ROD it is not in
3 containment.

4 So now what we need to do is we need to
5 run a measurement saying what, since the ROD we've
6 been out of containment X amount and this is where
7 and this is why and this is how we're going to fix
8 it, or we're out of containment to this degree and
9 this level and this is how we're going to make sure
10 that we don't get out of containment to this degree
11 and to this level and in this arena; am I right?

12 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, I believe there
13 were two questions in there.

14 LINDA WAGEMAN: Yes, there are.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes, first, we want to
16 ensure that we stay in containment henceforth and
17 forever more, and there are ways to -- that we want
18 to measure that, both through chemical, hydraulic
19 and modeling.

20 Modeling is a tool, modeling is never the
21 final answer to anything, and what do we do if we
22 are out of the containment. And --

23 LINDA WAGEMAN: Assuming, of course --
24 because once again we have to make the understanding
25 that when you say in containment, against what?

1 Against the ROD?

2 Because if we're looking at the ROD and
3 saying we're still in containment, that's a fallacy
4 because in accordance to the ROD we are not in
5 containment. So where is the benchmark to decide
6 containment, and then from there where are the
7 perimeters that you measure?

8 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, I wouldn't
9 necessarily agree with the statement we're not in
10 containment now.

11 SCOTT MARQUESS: May I take it?

12 LINDA WAGEMAN: Load Line 1.

13 SCOTT MARQUESS: Absolutely.

14 LINDA WAGEMAN: It's an honest question.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: And we acknowledge that
16 Load Line 1 was out of containment, no question
17 about that, we've agreed about that for a while.

18 In concert what we're saying in our
19 proposal is that when we do find ourselves out of
20 containment, and this one is a pretty obvious case,
21 what kind of response actions would we undertake to
22 get us back into containment.

23 And once we -- once we complete all of our
24 sampling and we've run this -- this system for a
25 short period of time, then we're confident that we

1 have achieved a containment.

2 LINDA WAGEMAN: So what's your benchmark
3 then for containment?

4 GARTH ANDERSON: Both the chemical and the
5 hydraulic measurements of the extraction well.

6 LINDA WAGEMAN: For what date, just the
7 current measurements, or help me out here?

8 SCOTT MARQUESS: I think the answer you
9 may be looking for may be the ROD.

10 LINDA WAGEMAN: Oh, gosh, I hope not.

11 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, it's -- well, I
12 think that map there generally depicts what's
13 different now relative to the ROD.

14 I think Load Line 1, the yellow area, the
15 ROD -- the yellow area is beyond what was identified
16 in the ROD, okay, so the corrective action has been
17 install two extraction wells, EWs-12 and 13 to the
18 south, and follow on focused extraction with EW-11
19 in the heart of the plume starting this year, work
20 to do.

21 LINDA WAGEMAN: So then your benchmark is
22 going to be based on the data from EW-12 and 11 --
23 or 12 or 13, whatever the magic number is, starting
24 this year; that's going to be your benchmark, your
25 jumping-off point? Yes, no?

1 SCOTT MARQUESS: I think that's fair.

2 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay. That is --

3 SCOTT MARQUESS: Also relative to the ROD,
4 I think just south of the blue, that's new, and I
5 think that's -- I mean, that was specifically
6 allowed for in the design of the system.

7 But that it was intended that if -- if the
8 line -- you know, where the blue line where
9 Garth was pointing was that the ROD -- there was
10 never any intention in the -- in the approved
11 remedial design, remedial action that that
12 contamination wouldn't go from the blue line to the
13 edge of the pink line because that's where the wells
14 were put in.

15 LINDA WAGEMAN: So once again, your
16 benchmark would be at the end of that pink line to
17 establish a measure of containment?

18 SCOTT MARQUESS: Yes.

19 LINDA WAGEMAN: Starting in 2006?

20 SCOTT MARQUESS: Shouldn't be anything
21 beyond EWs -- no, the yellow or the pink --

22 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay. And that's --

23 SCOTT MARQUESS: -- or the purple, to the
24 east.

25 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay. And that is

1 starting in 2006?

2 SCOTT MARQUESS: Correct. And --

3 LINDA WAGEMAN: And that is going to be

4 your benchmark for containment starting now?

5 SCOTT MARQUESS: Yes.

6 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay.

7 SCOTT MARQUESS: And the rest -- I just

8 want -- the rest of the equation is what makes it

9 difficult or what makes it hard isn't as much the

10 chemical part, excuse me.

11 LINDA WAGEMAN: This is a really bad night

12 for a meeting like this.

13 SCOTT MARQUESS: You're telling me.

14 LINDA WAGEMAN: We want beer.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: Lead the way, Linda, lead

16 the way. If we would have paid another 25 bucks

17 we'd have been able to bring it in.

18 SCOTT MARQUESS: But the hard part isn't

19 as much the chemical part, although there's a matter

20 of the sufficiency and the density of the monitoring

21 network, which needs to be improved; the harder part

22 is the hydraulic part, which is cheaper information.

23 You can -- and you can get it more

24 frequently, but it's a lot harder to interpret, and

25 that's kind of where the rub comes, what makes it

1 more difficult to say, all right, well, how much --
2 how much lower should the elevation of Well X be
3 compared to Well Y to say that we have gradient in
4 the right direction on a regular basis.

5 So -- but we want to have both the
6 chemical and the hydraulic component because we --
7 the more tools and the more things we have to find,
8 the more information we can get; we can get more
9 hydraulic information, we can get chemical
10 information, so we want to take advantage of that.

11 LINDA WAGEMAN: Oh, okay.

12 GARTH ANDERSON: Great. All right. One
13 other -- one other thing that we're -- yes, Lorus.

14 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Lorus Luetkenhaus.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: How are you doing?

16 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Just great.

17 I've got a friend, his definition of
18 getting the dishwasher loaded is to get his wife drunk.

19 We've been on this now, August 30th, 205
20 (sic) we were talking about this, this is now
21 April 206 (sic), six months later, and we still
22 don't have a definition.

23 Now, I know the government is slow, but,
24 see, that's kind of the problem here with you
25 people. You putts around and putts around and you

1 don't get anything done. You're still talking
2 about -- I haven't heard a promise that you'll have
3 it at the next meeting. Would you promise me that,
4 that's the question?

5 GARTH ANDERSON: What promise are you
6 looking for?

7 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: A working definition
8 of what you mean by containment.

9 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, we are still --
10 we'll still be in a -- I would hope we would, but
11 I'm not going to guarantee you anything because we
12 want to be sure that the three agencies are in
13 agreement with what the definition of containment
14 is. We're confident that we'll be there by then,
15 but -- if all goes according to our schedule.

16 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Thank you.

17 GARTH ANDERSON: You're welcome.

18 One thing we are pretty excited about and
19 we briefed it in the past is the site management
20 plan. As you recall, in -- we briefed it -- we
21 mentioned it a couple of times, but what we've
22 developed is an overall management strategy for the
23 entire site.

24 Now, we're about a week from finishing
25 that, tying the bow on it, having it ready for prime

1 time. The site management plan contains all the
2 elements that we -- that we talked about: Operation
3 of the treatment system and the extraction wells,
4 the groundwater monitoring program, additional
5 investigations in the interior of the plume; just
6 all the different aspects of the -- of the project
7 from now through at least 2010.

8 It comes with a scope of the work and the
9 products and the different documents that will be
10 delivered, the corresponding schedule and even a
11 little bit of cost data so you can see what -- you
12 know, how much this whole operation does cost.

13 So we -- we're -- again, we're excited
14 about this because we've gotten to the end point,
15 something that all three agencies agree on, and we
16 think it'd be a great topic to go into some detail
17 at a future meeting once it's all tied up and ready
18 to go.

19 LYNN MOORER: Excuse me, Mr. Anderson?

20 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

21 LYNN MOORER: Lynn Moorner again.

22 When the site management plan is finalized
23 will you put it in print large enough to read
24 without a large magnifying glass?

25 GARTH ANDERSON: We can -- we can -- would

1 you like that size? We can --

2 LYNN MOORER: Large enough to read without
3 a magnifying glass.

4 GARTH ANDERSON: We will provide both in
5 paper and those that prefer electronically, we'll
6 have that as well.

7 LYNN MOORER: That's not the question I
8 asked, Mr. Anderson, respectfully.

9 GARTH ANDERSON: We will --

10 LYNN MOORER: I've been going blind
11 looking at what you've been submitting. It is the
12 tiniest print I've ever seen, and its basically
13 impossible to print out and analyze it in any
14 sensible fashion.

15 So, again, my question is: Will you
16 provide that in print large enough to read without a
17 magnifying glass?

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes, it'll be a lot
19 thicker because it'll be a lot more pages, but we
20 can do that.

21 LYNN MOORER: Will you do it?

22 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

23 LYNN MOORER: We'll hold you to it. Thank
24 you.

25 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay. Let's move on.

1 Right now Mary Lyle is going to step up
2 and talk in some detail about a lot of the
3 groundwater sampling that we've been doing, as
4 promised in the last meeting.

5 Again, I would like to point out that we
6 are talking about third quarter 2005, which was
7 generally September; fourth quarter, which was
8 generally December; and then again what the plan is
9 for all of 2006.

10 And, again, these maps are difficult to
11 brief from because there's a lot of detail on them,
12 so anybody that wants to stick around, we'll be more
13 than to happy to go over specific data questions,
14 any specific questions about the groundwater
15 sampling plan, or any of the -- any of the results
16 that we've published so far.

17 So anyway, without further ado, Mary.

18 MARY LYLE: Thanks, Garth.

19 As Garth mentioned, we wanted to talk
20 first about September third quarter sampling,
21 because at the last RAB meeting we hadn't finished
22 validating all of the data yet.

23 So as the slide indicates, we've sampled
24 monitoring wells, residential wells and surface
25 water location in September.

1 The data that we saw had been fairly
2 consistent with what we've seen before. The
3 detections above the action levels were within the
4 plume boundaries, and those below were outside, so
5 as I said, fairly consistent with what we had
6 before.

7 We distributed those letters. It was to
8 the well owners before the RAB, and -- but it wasn't
9 until January that we were able to post the
10 quarterly data on the web site.

11 And as you came in here we had a CD of the
12 September sampling data tables, all the results, and
13 the reason we put it on CD was because the package
14 was 300 pages with all the tables and everything in
15 there, so if you'd rather have a paper copy let me
16 know. I can stick it in the mail when we get back
17 out, but that was what we brought this time.

18 Next slide, please, Garth.

19 In December we sampled again, and that was
20 shortly after the last RAB. Again, it was
21 monitoring wells, water supply wells and surface
22 water locations, and, again, the results were fairly
23 consistent with what we had seen in the past.

24 Just about a week or so ago we had sent
25 out the results to the well owners, so if you

1 haven't seen yours let me know, we can double-check
2 on that and answer any questions on that.

3 The December data was in a paper copy back
4 on the table if you wanted to look at the -- take
5 that home with you, and just yesterday or this
6 morning we posted that on the web site so it's also
7 available there.

8 CHRIS FUNK: Do you know, was my lake
9 sampled in one of those two samples?

10 MARY LYLE: The ski lake, are you asking
11 about the ski lake?

12 CHRIS FUNK: Yes.

13 MARY LYLE: I believe we sampled that last
14 summer, July. Have you -- have you not seen that
15 data?

16 CHRIS FUNK: No.

17 MARY LYLE: Okay. I apologize, we'll
18 definitely get that out. We can even talk to you
19 here after -- afterwards, but we have sampled that.
20 We have -- we do have that data, and I apologize
21 that we haven't sent that out to you.

22 MELISSA KONECKY: Would you be able to
23 summarize the results of the third quarter and the
24 fourth quarter separately?

25 I noticed in this fourth quarter stuff

1 that was e-mailed, you know, there were a few really
2 high results in a couple of the wells, and I'd have
3 to find the page, but --

4 LYNN MOORER: Talk about them.

5 MELISSA KONECKY: Yeah, like --

6 MARY LYLE: Well, yeah, I guess I can -- I
7 don't have the -- I need to look at the data tables
8 myself too. Off the top of my head I don't know
9 that.

10 GARTH ANDERSON: Ms. Konecky, do you have
11 a specific question that you'd like us to address?

12 MELISSA KONECKY: Well, I noticed that
13 there were a couple of water supply wells that were
14 particularly high in TCE, and then I noticed -- and
15 I have to find the pages, but some of those surface
16 water results were really high too, and I'll have to
17 find the page just so I have the specifics.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: All right. I think we
19 can talk about surface water real quick because we
20 actually discussed that earlier this afternoon among
21 our party, but Mary, if you can --

22 MARY LYLE: Sure. The ones that we see,
23 the detections that are consistent are SW-6, which
24 is right here inside the plume in Johnson Creek,
25 SW-8; those are probably the ones that are high.

1 Around 40 and 50 are what we've been seeing in the
2 last probably year and a half that we've been out
3 there; is that right, Brady?

4 BRADY BIGELOW: Yeah.

5 MARY LYLE: We also had some detections in
6 SW-10, which, again, is within the plume, so it
7 would be -- we've seen those above action level, and
8 then we've had some lower level detections again
9 below action levels in SW-12, which is down here
10 south of EW-1.

11 GARTH ANDERSON: One thing we would like
12 to point out when we talk action levels, the surface
13 water is different than groundwater.

14 Surface water -- although there's not a
15 specific action level right now for surface water,
16 it's one that we're developing based on a risk
17 assessment, but -- so when we talk above action
18 level, we generally talk about the groundwater
19 level, but the surface water is -- it's typically higher
20 than the drinking water standard.

21 CHRIS FUNK: Have you ever tested Johnson
22 between where it runs out of the plume and through
23 not plume and then back into the plume?

24 MARY LYLE: We --

25 CHRIS FUNK: Down farther, like right

1 across from my house. Yep.

2 MARY LYLE: We have -- we've tested 4 and
3 5 about a year and a half ago, and we didn't see
4 detections at levels that were -- I guess, Brady, you
5 might want to pull that data up for SW-4 and 5.

6 GARTH ANDERSON: We'll have Brady run
7 that number, and we'll get you a level here
8 before the end of the meeting.

9 MARY LYLE: To answer your question
10 about -- I think when we started this was November
11 of 2004, we sampled -- there were 12 along --
12 13 actually along Johnson Creek and Clear Creek,
13 started way up here, SW-1, and then we sampled about
14 six locations over here in Silver Creek.

15 And that was kind of our baseline, and we
16 kind of -- we've trimmed down to -- to the ones that
17 we saw -- we've seen more consistent detections in,
18 but every year when we reevaluate the groundwater
19 monitoring plan, we also reevaluate sampling of
20 surface water.

21 So as we see data in some of these wells
22 around these other surface water locations that --
23 that would warrant us going out there, we would
24 certainly add surface water locations and more frequent
25 sampling of some of those others.

1 LINDA WAGEMAN: Linda again.

2 In these meetings a long time back when we
3 started talking about surface water and then we also
4 talked about action levels and the difference
5 between above action levels and below action levels;
6 I think that the group here made it abundantly clear
7 that we're not remotely interested in the phrase
8 below action levels. That means nothing to me.

9 I'm interested in the variance percentage
10 on your -- on your monitoring. I don't care if it's
11 below action level. I want to know what the
12 variance is, and I want to know when, I want to know
13 the month that it's been tested in so that I can go
14 in and I can check year by year by year and track
15 it.

16 Okay. Which, A, I shouldn't have to do,
17 but I'll do, so my question to you, Garth, is:
18 What's the variance on EW-10? Okay, granted it's
19 below action level, I don't have my data in front of
20 me unfortunately, but what are we looking at?

21 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, we can certainly
22 answer that question, that's why we have the
23 database, and it's a familiar conversation.

24 We -- we love the database. It's a very
25 easy query to do, so any specific questions that

1 people have regarding data, whether it's a variance,
2 a trend, historical data, we have it in here so we
3 can run that.

4 LINDA WAGEMAN: I appreciate the fact that
5 you've got all this data, I think that's awesome.

6 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay.

7 LINDA WAGEMAN: I'm very pleased to hear
8 that, but I'm not going to go out and seek it; it's
9 your responsibility to provide it to me. I pay you
10 to do that job, I expect that job to be done, and
11 unless you people put me on salary to what I am
12 almost going to demand here pretty soon, plus
13 benefits and a good pension plan, I'm not going to
14 do it.

15 You know, as far the questions and stuff,
16 I'll be more than happy to do that.

17 GARTH ANDERSON: Got it, thanks.

18 LINDA WAGEMAN: -- and I'll take --

19 GARTH ANDERSON: We appreciate that offer.

20 LINDA WAGEMAN: -- responsibility, yes,
21 but as far as this below action level stuff, don't
22 ever come to this meeting again in my presence and
23 have the audacity to say below action level or above
24 action level.

25 I want to know specifically what, because

1 anything beyond that is not satisfactory. I should
2 not have to repeat myself. I don't like to, it's
3 not right.

4 So once again, when we're talking about
5 EW-10, I'm glad to hear it's below action level;
6 don't remotely care. I want to know what it was,
7 what it is, what the variance is, what is the
8 percentage, and when specifically, you know, when
9 you're comparing these variances, what months are
10 you comparing it to.

11 GARTH ANDERSON: I assume you're talking
12 SW-10, surface water sample, not EW?

13 LINDA WAGEMAN: Right.

14 GARTH ANDERSON: Understand, I think it's
15 a great -- great thing to look at, and for tonight,
16 we'll have Brady Bigelow run that number just
17 to --

18 LINDA WAGEMAN: Can we start putting --
19 I'm really trying to make a point here because we
20 are trying to get detail.

21 Once again, we've got MUD pumping, once
22 again, the surface water goes into the Platte, okay,
23 which is a federally protected river; how about next
24 RAB and every RAB going forward, when we have these
25 results, maybe we can put something in there to that

1 effect because if you're tracking this plume you're
2 going to have that data anyway.

3 GARTH ANDERSON: That is one thing we do
4 take into consideration when we're looking at data.
5 We look at data trends to determine the frequency of
6 a particular well. If something's been holding
7 steady for ten years then maybe you cut the
8 frequency back a little bit.

9 LINDA WAGEMAN: EW-10 has not been holding
10 steady.

11 GARTH ANDERSON: I understand, I'm talking
12 in general. If we see -- if we see a data point,
13 whether it's a well or a surface water point, and we
14 see an increase in trend, then that would be a sign
15 to us to either increase the sampling frequency or
16 try to figure out why it's increasing.

17 LINDA WAGEMAN: Until you come to this
18 meeting and then you tell us it's below action
19 level, and so, see, we need to understand the
20 difference because not everybody here ponders over
21 the reports like sick-warped me, okay, not everybody
22 does that.

23 So, you know, we need to stop providing a
24 false sense of security, and let's provide some
25 honesty and say that this is kind of what we found,

1 you shouldn't be worried about it, and this is why,
2 and that'll give us a much greater comfort level
3 than below action level, because I don't trust below
4 action level.

5 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay.

6 MELISSA KONECKY: When you guys take these
7 surface water samples do you do it the same way like
8 the NRD goes out and takes like a sample from the
9 stream, from each -- you know, from the middle and
10 the sides, or do you go out into the lake and just
11 take a sample from the same point each time or --

12 MARY LYLE: It is the same point each
13 time.

14 MELISSA KONECKY: Like a lake or whatever?

15 MARY LYLE: In the creek we have a gauge
16 where we mark where we've sampled previously, so
17 we'll go out and try to, as close as possible,
18 repeat that very same sample every quarter.

19 MELISSA KONECKY: You know, I noticed like
20 it looks like there's a lot of vinyl chloride in
21 some of these samples of surface water, and I wasn't
22 sure, you know, what -- what numbers -- you know,
23 where the points referred to, but, I mean, I'm sure
24 it's way above action levels according to my sheet I
25 printed out from the EPA.

1 MARY LYLE: I'll have Brady run that.

2 I'm not familiar with the vinyl chloride.

3 CHRIS FUNK: So when you say it's above
4 action level, what do you do; what action are you
5 taking?

6 MARY LYLE: Well, actually it starts --

7 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, surface water,
8 there's -- probably shouldn't use the term action
9 level on surface water right now anyway because
10 there is no established action level.

11 In fact, the only regulatory limit right
12 now that the -- you know, for state water quality is
13 higher than we would even be comfortable with, so
14 what we're doing is working with EPA to run --
15 determine a level based on realistic exposure and
16 realistic use of the stream and how people would be
17 exposed to that contamination to determine what --
18 what level would be -- would not cause elevated
19 risk.

20 So right now that level is -- we're in the
21 same -- the preliminary calculation kind of showed
22 the same order of magnitude as what we're seeing as
23 kind of a screening level, but we're going to get
24 more definition on that as we work with EPA to
25 develop that.

1 LYNN MOORER: Mr. Anderson.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

3 LYNN MOORER: Lynn Moorner again.

4 I would respectfully request yet again
5 that whenever the Corps presents the results, which
6 we're anxious to hear at each of the RAB meetings as
7 to the latest sampling that you have done, please be
8 prepared to tell us specifically the chief findings
9 each time.

10 Now, sometimes you have done it. I recall
11 that you -- sometimes you'll give us a list of what
12 the chief findings are. Like, for example,
13 December 2004 when you found the 12 of TCE in SW-11
14 in Clear Creek; we want to know the chief findings.

15 It's not helpful, it's meaningless to us
16 to say as you do there on both of your slides,
17 results correlate to historic concentrations; I'm
18 sorry, that really is pretty meaningless, especially
19 for folks who are here for the first time at this
20 meaning.

21 We've asked you previously, Ms. Konecky,
22 RAB co-chair, has asked you specifically on repeated
23 occasions, please come prepared to the meetings at
24 least to give us a snapshot of the chief detections,
25 the chief findings for each of your quarters. We'd

1 like you to do that, please do that.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: When we talked to --
3 again, this is going to be a regular feature at
4 every RAB meeting. We shifted everything by a month
5 so that as our quarterly sampling results come in,
6 it's -- it correlates to a RAB meeting.

7 So the July RAB meeting will be a little
8 more specific. We'll still come with lots of --
9 with maps to talk from, the database and all the
10 rest, but our brief and slide, we'll try to
11 highlight some more specifics findings; that should
12 not be difficult.

13 LYNN MOORER: Thank you. I just want to
14 note for folks who might be interested to know, you
15 may remember at least a couple meetings ago we had
16 quite a discussion about the Artesian Well, it's
17 Mr. Dending's property, and there was a big concern
18 about whether or not at the action level -- it was
19 approaching action level and then it went up to 5,
20 well, the -- I think one of the chief things that
21 folks might want to know is then the fourth quarter
22 2005 result is now -- it's at 13, 13.7, at that
23 Artesian Well.

24 GARTH ANDERSON: Mary, can you point to
25 where the Artesian Well is so people can get --

1 LYNN MOORER: Yeah, Mr. McReynolds would
2 like to have you explain why that happened, why that
3 increased; why it's now at 13.7 when it was roughly
4 at about 5? I'd say it was at least two meetings
5 ago, maybe a little longer ago than that.

6 MARY LYLE: Well, that well is actually
7 located within the plume, and it's just been a few
8 years that we've actually been sampling it, so it's
9 just a shifting of -- of the water over in this
10 area.

11 And just to clarify that, that is an
12 irrigation well, and the owner is not using that as
13 a potable well, so we've -- you know, we've been
14 monitoring that so that they -- so that that is not
15 used as a potable source.

16 And, as I said, it's -- it is within the
17 plume, so it's not unlikely that we would see
18 concentrations in -- in that well that are above two
19 parts per billion.

20 LYNN MOORER: I think the question,
21 Ms. Lyle, is why is it increasing and at the rate
22 that it is increasing?

23 SCOTT MARQUESS: I'll hazard a guess.

24 GARTH ANDERSON: Scott, take it away.

25 SCOTT MARQUESS: All right. Generally,

9 GARTH ANDERSON: Let me untangle this cord
10 for you.

14 So contaminants moving this way, we should
15 expect to see the wells to the south increase in
16 concentration.

21 It's shown over there the results, and if
22 you look at it in detail, they did some sampling
23 last fall, I think, I don't know, they just
24 completed -- I guess there's a little more to do --

1 field doing the Phase 2.

2 SCOTT MARQUESS: If you look at the data,
3 what you'll start to see is this is a five line for
4 TCE, this is a five line for TCE. What you have in
5 between there is a much more highly contaminated and
6 highly concentrated smaller strip of contamination
7 that kind of starts up this way and kind of runs
8 around on the western side and is pretty narrow,
9 maybe a few hundred -- 500 feet or more, runs down
10 through here and starts coming up right through
11 here.

12 And low and behold, if you look at
13 Johnson Creek, SW-08 right here, which I think is
14 the highest surface water detection for TCE that we
15 have, I think maybe in the 50s up to 60, that's
16 where this plume hits. And so what you do about it,
17 that's what the focused extraction component in the
18 ROD is supposed to address.

19 So if what we have out here is somewhere
20 between 5 and 20 parts per billion of TCE along this
21 edge, what we have in this narrow band is up to a
22 thousand or 1500 parts per billion of TCE, this is
23 the part we want to fix, and when we fix that, then
24 what you'll see is that stuff that's discharging
25 from groundwater to surface water is going to

1 dissipate.

2 And we're going to be in a position to
3 show all that to you when this data becomes
4 available in the next months -- few months, and part
5 of the site management plan is to take that next
6 step and go in and address this hot area.

7 So don't look at this as -- this is not
8 all the same, this is not a homogenous . There's a
9 small area through here that's concentrated, and we
10 can manage that; that's the part that you can
11 address.

12 If you have a large dilute plume it's
13 really hard to get your hands on it and remediate
14 it. You can contain it, but to make it all go away,
15 it's large and dilute, it's very, very difficult.

16 What we're finding, and I expect what
17 we'll find as we go across the site from east to
18 west, we're going to find highly contaminated zones
19 that you're going to focus on, and that's what the
20 ROD intends for us to do to clean the site up and
21 remove as much mass as possible as quickly as
22 possible.

23 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Dave McReynolds, I live
24 pretty close in that area, and as you guys well
25 know, and you can probably give us the data, 54 has

1 been high for a long time; are you trying to tell us
2 that 54 has gone down and it's pushed on farther
3 south, because this has gone up, you know, and it is
4 south and east of that?

5 There's no houses real close or any wells
6 straight east of it, of 54, which has been high for
7 a long time.

8 GARTH ANDERSON: What do we have for
9 54 currently, can somebody look that up, please?

10 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: They also have TC and
11 RDX both.

12 MARY LYLE: If I can address that, and
13 this is actually probably, I'm suspecting, part of
14 Melissa's question too, these residential wells are
15 located within the plume, if they're the ones that
16 you're talking about, and they do receive carbon
17 treatment.

18 And so every time these -- in the homes we
19 have two carbon units, and so that when the water
20 comes in, it goes through the first one and then it
21 goes through the second one, and then the people are
22 able to use the water.

23 We always sample in between the two carbon
24 units so that we can monitor breakthrough. If we
25 start to see detections that make us know that we

1 need to change that first carbon filter treatment,
2 then that's what that data tells us.

3 There's still -- even if we see
4 detections, they're still protected by the second
5 carbon unit, but we always monitor in between, and
6 sometimes we monitor the water before it goes into
7 even the first one, which I suspect is the data that
8 Melissa was referring to earlier.

9 So those higher concentrations we know are
10 coming in already to the carbon unit, but those
11 people are not at risk because they're protected by
12 the treatment system.

13 MELISSA KONECKY: That's quarterly that
14 the people's water supplies are being tested?

15 MARY LYLE: With the carbon treatment,
16 we -- I think do we sample those semiannually or is
17 it --

18 BRADY BIGELOW: It recently changed, but
19 before it depends on -- I can look that up to
20 verify. I don't know off the top of my head.

21 I believe those are at least semiannual,
22 but let me look that up real quick and I can let you
23 know.

24 MELISSA KONECKY: Thank you.

25 LINDA WAGEMAN: Back to Dendinger's

1 irrigation well; there were readings of TCE at 13.
2 The question regarding the irrigation well is this:
3 Is it currently being used as an irrigation well,
4 does anybody know?

5 MARY LYLE: Yes, it is.

6 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay. TCE has a half-life
7 of 14 days. Is it 14 days or 7, Scott? I can't
8 remember, I want to say -- okay. It's seven days.

9 So if we take this well that's currently
10 sitting at 13 on TCE and we say, okay, it's going to
11 have a half-life, let's drop it down to 6.5, that's
12 still above action level, and we're going to shoot
13 it out in the air when this man irrigates his field;
14 that really pisses me off.

15 Okay. So when Mary turns around and says,
16 oh, it's just an irrigation well, it's a good thing
17 I'm behind this table, okay, because you don't shoot
18 13 out in my area and say, oh, it's just, okay, we
19 got kids out here.

20 Now, I want to know since the Corps knows
21 that this is an active irrigation well and the Corps
22 and the EPA know that it is being registered at 13,
23 I want to know how the EPA, the Environmental
24 Protection Agency, is going to do precisely that,
25 protect my environment.

1 What are you going to do with this
2 irrigation well; are you going to halt it, minimize
3 it, slap a carbon filter on it, what?
4 SCOTT MARQUESS: We have other sites in
5 Nebraska where we use irrigation wells as a
6 remediation tool to strip the volatiles from the
7 groundwater as it's sprayed up, and we checked on
8 this a while back.

9 This is something we came up and talked
10 about with somebody here maybe several months, a
11 year ago, and the -- at the other site -- do you
12 know, Alyse, what site is it?

13 ALYSE STOY: Hastings.

14 SCOTT MARQUESS: Hastings. I think it's
15 Dr. Spaulding from the University of Nebraska came
16 up with an irrigation nozzle and helped -- to help
17 strip the volatiles out of the groundwater.

18 In terms of what risks are associated with
19 that at that site, the levels that they were
20 spraying out through the irrigation system, I
21 believe -- don't quote me, I believe the values were
22 about 500 to 600 parts per billion TCE, and that was
23 deemed not to pose a significant risk to -- and I
24 can't -- I can't regurgitate what the exposure
25 setting was at that site relative to this site.

1 I can certainly look into that and get you
2 that information, tell you what that -- how that
3 translates to here, but at first blush, you know, at
4 13 in an irrigation well, I wouldn't anticipate that
5 if we're allowed in other sites and we found out
6 it's protecting at 500 to 600 parts per billion, I
7 wouldn't anticipate that 13 would pose a problem.

8 LINDA WAGEMAN: How much does this nozzle
9 cost?

10 SCOTT MARQUESS: I couldn't tell you.

11 LINDA WAGEMAN: Why don't we find out?

12 SCOTT MARQUESS: And I don't believe it's
13 necessarily specific to a nozzle. I think it's more
14 so a function of the volatilization and the
15 atmospheric travel for the water more so than a
16 specific --

17 LINDA WAGEMAN: If I have a puddle of
18 water and I put my foot in this puddle of water and
19 it is sitting at, you know, 6.5 TCE, you're going to
20 turn around and tell me that's not a bad thing?
21 Have you ever walked a field after it's been
22 irrigated?

23 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, I don't know
24 whether there's a 6.5 puddle --

25 LINDA WAGEMAN: Well, if TCE shoots up in

1 the air and it has a half-life, taking its level
2 from 13 down 6.5 and it's going to be floating out
3 in the -- in the environment and in the atmosphere
4 for seven days, that's just according to the EPA's
5 web site, I'm just spewing off what you guys have
6 been telling me --

7 SCOTT MARQUESS: I don't think that's the
8 way to interpret what that half-life means.

9 LINDA WAGEMAN: Okay. How would I
10 interpret that then?

11 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, there's other
12 processes -- that's a natural decay phenomena, okay.

13 LINDA WAGEMAN: Once it hits the sun
14 light?

15 SCOTT MARQUESS: Yeah, but that's not --
16 that doesn't account for the TCE that's volatilized
17 as it's coming out of the nozzle, so that's going in
18 the air, what -- that's the seven days, okay.

19 LINDA WAGEMAN: Uh-huh.

20 SCOTT MARQUESS: So now I have TCE in the
21 air, I don't have it in the water, so what's hitting
22 the ground isn't -- that's not a function of the
23 half-life. It's a function of the number of
24 chemical properties of TCE in water.

25 LINDA WAGEMAN: You know, we've discussed

1 this issue, we discussed this issue about a year and
2 a half ago, so I guess basically what you're telling
3 me is we do have an irrigation well in a dangerous
4 location that's still being used to irrigate fields
5 that are going to be cultivated and processed for
6 food to give to other people, and we shouldn't be
7 remotely concerned about it?

8 So if you're telling me to sit down, kick
9 me feet up, watch TV and go to bed or whatever, then
10 come right out and say that, but I'm sorry, Scott, I
11 don't buy it.

12 SCOTT MARQUESS: I'll be happy to go back
13 and look at -- I mean, this is not the first time
14 this has been an issue.

15 LINDA WAGEMAN: We've been around on this.

16 SCOTT MARQUESS: So I mean, I'd be happy
17 to show you what information we have and talk about
18 it with you, go over it; I don't believe that
19 there's a significant risk posed by that condition
20 that you just outlined.

21 LINDA WAGEMAN: Significant risk or risk,
22 and your belief versus my belief? I guess, you
23 know, let's check and see how much protecting that
24 irrigation well would cost and if it behooves us to
25 slap it in the budget, slap in it budget.

1 I mean, Good Lord, if it's under -- you
2 know, if it's under 2500 bucks let me know what it
3 is and I'll write a damn check. It's that
4 important, and you guys need to understand that.

5 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, we understand and
6 that's --

7 LINDA WAGEMAN: Then let's act on it then.
8 Let's find out exactly what it's going to cost to
9 take care of this irrigation well, and then you can
10 show me all your data later, deal?

11 SCOTT MARQUESS: Just to reiterate, we
12 act -- our program is a risk-based program, okay.
13 We -- EPA has authority to compel responsible
14 parties to abate risks associated with hazardous
15 substances that exceed the ten to minus four to ten
16 to minus six carcinogenic risk.

17 If we don't exceed that kind of a risk we
18 don't have the authority to compel parties to take a
19 response action, okay.

20 LINDA WAGEMAN: Maybe --

21 SCOTT MARQUESS: Let me --

22 LINDA WAGEMAN: But maybe a resident who's
23 willing to foot the bill does, and maybe if we ask,
24 they'd be willing to do something.

25 So in other words, until it becomes

1 detrimental to one's health, the federal authorities
2 can't help. Well, I'm not willing to wait that
3 long. I told you, I'm not willing to wait that
4 long.

5 So I'm not remotely interested, as we've
6 discussed in the past, what a group of think-tankers
7 decided in Washington one day over a bucket of
8 chicken, I don't care, okay.

9 I know what the EPA is doing in various
10 parts of the country, and they do a very good job.
11 I also know what the EPA does in other parts of the
12 country and they don't do a very good job, and we
13 can banter back and forth. I don't care about
14 Kearney, I could care less about Kearney. All I
15 care about is this plume and the people around it.

16 SCOTT MARQUESS: Let me try and give an
17 example to address your concern about the potential
18 for regulating things below regulatory levels, okay.

19 We used to have a speed limit in the
20 country of 55 miles an hour, so we found that there
21 were less accidents at 55, yet we raised the speed
22 limit back to 70, okay, so what if the highway
23 patrolman came up to you on your drive home tonight
24 and said you're going 62 miles an hour, that's more
25 risky than going 55, it's less than 70, you're

1 allowed to go 70, but me a highway patrolman, I'm
2 going to issue a ticket; do think that would be
3 equitable?

4 LINDA WAGEMAN: I think that as an arm of
5 the law, quite frankly speaking, knowing that the
6 speed limit -- speed limit is 70, if, for one reason
7 or another, he would pull me over and give me a
8 ticket for doing 62, I would have to take on belief
9 to the extent to which I believe that that officer
10 was protecting my life and my property, I would have
11 to believe that he is looking out for my best
12 interest.

13 So if he's going to turn around and give
14 me a ticket for going 62 miles an hour in a 70-mile
15 per hour limit zone I would, in fact -- I would, in
16 fact, accept it.

17 Once again we're not looking at limits,
18 we're looking at what is best regarding the
19 situation.

20 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, I think it's kind
21 of analogous, okay, I don't think you're going to
22 have find too many police officers who are going to
23 stop you and issue you a ticket when you're going
24 62 if the speed limit is 70, so --

25 LINDA WAGEMAN: I can't answer to that,

1 I'm not a cop, but I bet you -- I bet you if they
2 had -- you know, maybe if they did maybe we wouldn't
3 have so many traffic incidents.

4 And it's Not 70, everywhere it's 55 and
5 65, it's 45 based on the level of danger.

6 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: You're not talking
7 about -- it's over the level. It's not 62, it's
8 above the level, so you're not even talking about
9 the same thing. It's above the level, it's clear up
10 to 13.

11 SCOTT MARQUESS: In the Artesian Well,
12 right, so the level --

13 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Yeah, and that's a new
14 area, and it's going to keep moving until you get it
15 under control.

16 SCOTT MARQUESS: Absolutely, which is
17 absolutely why you have to --

18 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: He ought to be able to
19 answer what 54 is now if 54 is gone in any -- down
20 any.

21 I mean, you haven't answered any of our
22 questions. We've asked different locations, what
23 they were, and you haven't answered any of those.

24 SCOTT MARQUESS: I'll be happy to track --
25 Brady, 54.

1 BRADY BIGELOW: Yeah.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: We're running the data
3 checks as quick as we can. We've got the ski lake
4 data to Chris Funk.

5 MARY LYLE: To get back to Melissa's
6 question about the carbon unit sampling, in 2005 we
7 sampled the before, which is probably that higher
8 data that you saw two times, and then in between
9 quarterly, the in between sample quarterly to
10 monitor for breakthrough.

11 MELISSA KONECKY: Oh.

12 GARTH ANDERSON: Lorus.

13 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Got a copy from the
14 Kansas City Corps here, May 4th of '05, it says you
15 say you will acknowledge and respond to every
16 concern raised at each RAB meeting; it's your -- it
17 belongs to you, sir.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Keep going.

19 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: On this plume up here,
20 we've got U, we've got J, we've got UJ, we've got
21 under action levels; none of that is shown up here.

22 Now, to respond to my question, would you
23 do that for the future meetings anytime there's a
24 detection? I don't care how you do it, if you want
25 to draw it on this map or put an overlay on it, can

1 outline it, and then the next three months we'll be
2 able to see where it's going, because right now this
3 is all above action level; is that correct?

4 GARTH ANDERSON: That's correct.

5 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: All right. So the
6 public doesn't have any idea where in the hell this
7 stuff is out there, follow me?

8 GARTH ANDERSON: I understand.

9 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: You've got fingertips
10 that are going out with stuff that are below action
11 levels; would you please depict that on a map for us
12 in the future?

13 GARTH ANDERSON: Yeah, I think at worst
14 case you're going -- if you reported out to a
15 nondetect you wouldn't see a whole lot of change in
16 this -- in the shape of this map.

17 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: My question was: Is
18 would you do that for us, sir?

19 GARTH ANDERSON: I -- we can attempt to do
20 a meaningful depiction. I don't know if it'll be
21 meaningful, but I don't -- what we're trying to
22 depict here is how we're containing the plume and
23 where it is, if it's above the regulatory limit.

24 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Your own document, you
25 will respond, is what you said; it's in black and

1 white, would you like to read it?

2 GARTH ANDERSON: I know what it says.

3 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: All right, sir, then I
4 would appreciate it if future meetings you will
5 depict that on a map somehow so we can -- it doesn't
6 have to be that one, I don't care, but each meeting
7 so that we can see where this sucker is going.

8 And it's going to become very important
9 when MUD starts pumping their water, I'll guarantee
10 you, because it might be under action level, I want
11 to know where it's going. Thank you.

12 GARTH ANDERSON: We're pretty confident we
13 know where it's going, right into our extraction
14 wells.

15 All right. Any other questions? Looks
16 like we're almost getting toward the end of the
17 evening here.

18 Again, any specific questions about data
19 if you have a question about your well or any -- or
20 other points, we will stay here and talk about that;
21 if you'd like to go back to the map and talk about
22 data we'd be more than happy to do that.

23 MARY LYLE: Mr. McReynolds, were you
24 asking, I'm sorry, about Water Supply Well 54?

25 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: No, Residential Well 54.

1 MARY LYLE: Residential Well 54, when we
2 sampled that --

3 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: What is the level?

4 MARY LYLE: TCE and RDX, when we sampled
5 that, those were both below 1 part per billion in
6 2005.

7 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay. Mary, I guess we
8 can move on to the March -- the 2006 GMP.

9 MARY LYLE: And I put this slide together
10 just to identify what we plan to do in March. We
11 finished up this past monday, that data will be out
12 before the next RAB meeting in July.

13 The maps in the back on the back wall show
14 our plan for 2006 during each quarter for monitoring
15 wells, water supply wells, and at the very end we're
16 going to be sampling the surface water locations on
17 this map on a quarterly basis.

18 I think this -- just -- this provides a
19 total of everything that we're going to be sampling
20 in 2006 over 70 -- I'm sorry, 71 residential water
21 supply wells, and based on their frequency, those
22 will be sampled various -- various times during the
23 year.

24 Some of them are quarterly if they're
25 within the plume, and they have typically quarterly.

1 We also will continue with the one-mile buffer
2 sampling on an annual basis; that will be next
3 September.

4 Over a total of 109 monitoring wells are
5 planned for 2006, and then quarterly sampling at
6 13 surface water locations.

7 GARTH ANDERSON: All right. Great,
8 thanks. Oh, question in the back.

9 LYNN MOORER: I recall seeing a document
10 that mentioned a half-mile line, and I remember it
11 having something to do with the context of EPA; is
12 that an EPA-lead issue? Who can address that?

13 GARTH ANDERSON: I can address that.

14 LYNN MOORER: What's that talking about
15 and what's anticipated and what's the time line?

16 GARTH ANDERSON: What we're talking about
17 is getting a little more structure to the sampling
18 within the one-mile buffer zone.

19 The one-mile buffer zone sampling will
20 continue, and what we -- a concept we came up with
21 is we drew another line that's in between the
22 one-mile and the plume, we just call it a half-mile
23 line--Lisa is pointing to it--and residential wells
24 that are inside the half-mile line, we're going to
25 be sampling semiannually, and those on the other

1 side of the half-mile line will be annual.

2 Previous -- that's actually an increase in
3 the amount of sampling that we've been doing in the
4 one-mile buffer zone.

5 We thought those that were closer to the
6 plume warranted more frequent sampling, and the rest
7 would continue on the same frequency as we had done
8 over the past two years.

9 LYNN MOORER: Is this a result of the
10 dispute resolution process when the Corps was
11 dragging its feet, or shall we say coming up with
12 excuses why they didn't want to sample as frequently
13 as EPA and DEQ wanted them to sample?

14 GARTH ANDERSON: Let me tell you what we
15 did do for the 2006 sampling plan.

16 LYNN MOORER: That's a yes or no question,
17 Mr. Anderson.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: I'm not going to answer a
19 yes or no question, it's a loaded question so
20 I'll -- let me tell you what I am -- what we are
21 talking about for 2006, because we did have some
22 disagreements over 2005 sampling.

23 We doubled our efforts to get the sampling
24 plans done early, in agreement early, and we sat
25 down at the table several times in late 2005 and

1 early 2006 to -- to make sure we all agreed on what
2 the sampling frequency would be, and we -- we worked
3 cooperatively, and we reached what we think is a
4 very good plan on 2006.

5 So at this point we are -- right now we
6 are in complete agreement to what the 2006 sampling
7 plan will be. Will there -- could there be changes,
8 you bet.

9 If we see some data point that needs to be
10 addressed or some -- something that is unusual, then
11 we may modify the plan as we go along, or if other
12 circumstances arise that warrant some additional
13 sampling.

14 So the process worked, we got to agreement
15 early before we even went out and did -- took our
16 first sample in March.

17 LYNN MOORER: May I ask another follow-up
18 question on something?

19 GARTH ANDERSON: Certainly.

20 LYNN MOORER: Early in the meeting on your
21 little fact sheet here it says Item 2, the status
22 report on EW-12 and EW-13, you -- it says, EW-12 is
23 extracting more water than was originally expected.

24 So I have two questions: What was
25 projected, what did you expect, and then what is the

1 actual?

2 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay. Brady, do you
3 want to address that because you have a good handle
4 on the specifics on 12 and 13.

5 BRADY BIGELOW: I'd have to look up in
6 the table exactly what it is. The -- the rates
7 actually change according to the model over time,
8 meaning that EW-12 pumps a little higher at first
9 and then would slowly drop down in concentration --
10 correct me if I'm wrong on any of this, Lisa.

11 The -- the long-term pumping rates are, I
12 believe, in 225, 210, something in that area. When
13 we put this well in we were able to take it up much
14 higher, get much more production out of it, and even
15 still it's in a position where we can increase it a
16 little bit more if we needed to, but right now we're
17 collecting data.

18 Actually we've been -- at first we
19 collected data -- we're collecting monthly right now
20 in all the monitoring wells that you see down in the
21 area, the Load Line 1 monitoring wells, and once all
22 that data is collected -- actually we're feeding
23 that as we get it to URS, and URS is running the
24 model, and that'll give us a better idea of the
25 capture in that area.

1 But because of where it is, it looks like
2 it's in a very good spot to capture, and we're able
3 to get a lot more water in.

4 LYNN MOORER: Will you get those specific
5 numbers for me that I asked for?

6 BRADY BIGELOW: Which ones? I got a lot
7 over there.

8 LYNN MOORER: What was projected and what
9 was the actual --

10 BRADY BIGELOW: Sure.

11 LYNN MOORER: -- for EW-12? Thank you.

12 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes, sir.

13 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: There's several of us
14 that'd like to know Monitoring Well 85 --

15 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

16 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: -- because at 2/26/05,
17 it was five times the limit.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

19 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: And so we'd like
20 an update on that if possible.

21 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay.

22 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: All three levels as they
23 do do -- they do those monitoring wells on three
24 different levels.

25 GARTH ANDERSON: Right. What we did, we

1 did have a hit in MW-85 that was above the action
2 level, and what that did was it triggered additional
3 sampling on our part so that we could understand why
4 it was high.

5 In a case like this, if we have something
6 that seems unusual, like, for instance MW-85, first
7 thing we do is we go out and resample the well. We
8 want to make sure that that is, in fact, a true
9 piece of data, because sometimes other things happen
10 like a lab may screw up, something is transcribed
11 wrong. There are a number of things. So we go out
12 and sample it several many more times to make sure
13 that is a true result.

14 In addition, we -- we -- we went out with
15 some direct push sampling, that's where we put a
16 geoprobe down in the ground and collect samples at
17 various depths to ensure that there's nothing up
18 gradient or beside it or around it that would have
19 caused that kind of spike.

20 And after doing that investigation just
21 last year we found that that MW-85 was not a -- not
22 a -- was really nothing to indicate there was
23 something unusual going on that we had broken
24 containment. We haven't seen any levels like that
25 since in any of our sampling.

1 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Is it there in two
2 levels?

3 GARTH ANDERSON: I'm going to have to have
4 Brady Bigelow run that number too.

5 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: All right. Because --

6 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes, Scott.

7 SCOTT MARQUESS: The ten was only in one
8 level, the 85B.

9 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: The second time I heard
10 it was two levels, that it was two different levels.
11 It was low, but it was in two different levels.

12 SCOTT MARQUESS: I can specifically
13 address that. The ten was in 85B, one well.

14 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Yeah, right, when it was
15 really high.

16 SCOTT MARQUESS: There were detections at
17 1 to 1.4, and other wells -- and you can see the
18 data here, you know, if you'd like to look at it
19 later, that well at that location, and then all the
20 sampling that was around that, so --

21 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: But, you know, just
22 three-fourths a mile north they've had it in that well,
23 residential well for a long time, and it's been high
24 right up the road.

25 GARTH ANDERSON: Which --

1 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: 52A.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: Yeah, 52A is actually in
3 the plume, and you would expect to see contamination
4 there.

5 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Yeah, but this is south
6 of there.

7 GARTH ANDERSON: Right, yeah, but if you
8 look at, you have almost a direct line. Between
9 52 and 85 you have Extraction Well 3, and you can
10 almost draw a straight line between the three.

11 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: So you're telling us
12 that Extraction 3 is going to take care of that
13 problem, that it's not going to get any higher down
14 there at 85?

15 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

16 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: That's what I wanted to
17 know.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: I think --

19 LYNN MOORER: Just a quick clarification,
20 we do appreciate having the court reporter, we do
21 appreciate the professional videographer, as I
22 explained to Mr. Bigelow, when he attempted to
23 answer to his question -- my question privately, the
24 answer needs to be given out loud, it needs to go on
25 the record, and that -- as you know, there are -- a

1 lot of people aren't able to attend these meetings.

2 That's one of the reasons why the
3 transcript's valuable, so I just respectfully urge
4 you all to resist your habit of saying, look, you
5 can come talk to me about it later or I'll give you
6 the answer here privately.

7 No, we all want to know it, and the other
8 thing is it needs to all be on the record, so I ask
9 Mr. Bigelow to give the answer out loud when he has
10 it for everyone.

11 GARTH ANDERSON: Brady, you got it for
12 us?

13 LYNN MOORER: Mr. Anderson, I ask that all
14 the questions be answered out loud to everyone like
15 that.

16 GARTH ANDERSON: Sure.

17 LYNN MOORER: Thank you.

18 SCOTT MARQUESS: I'll just -- I want to
19 make sure that everyone here knows that EPA is
20 perfectly willing and able to discuss with any one
21 of you one on one any questions that you have or
22 anything that you'd like to have answered
23 individually.

24 It doesn't all have to be as a group, and
25 we're perfectly willing to talk with you one on one,

1 and it doesn't have to be in a group setting.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: And, of course, the Army
3 extends the same offer, that's why we have the open
4 houses before the RAB meeting.

5 If your schedule doesn't accommodate
6 coming to the meeting, and -- or if you have a
7 complex question that you may want us to help you
8 answer, so we can go up the map and spend a little
9 time discussing it and maybe running the data on our
10 computer.

11 Brady, do you have --

12 BRADY BIGELOW: Yeah, I've got --

13 GARTH ANDERSON: First, can you restate
14 the question so that we all --

15 BRADY BIGELOW: The question was what --
16 oh, I hope I get this right. The -- what is the
17 projected pumping rates of EW-12 and how does that
18 relate to what we're pumping at right now.

19 The -- as I tried to explain before, the
20 way that the design is set up is EW-12 starts the
21 pump first and then over the years EW-13 increases
22 in volume while EW-12 drops, and that -- I'm not a
23 groundwater person so you'll have to bear with me a
24 little bit, but that sort of steers the plume over a
25 little bit; that's the intent.

1 Right now we're pumping at 325 during the
2 start-up, we're pumping right at the design rate,
3 and then for the first Year 3 and 4, which is last
4 year and this year, we stay at 325, and then we drop
5 to 225 to 2 -- during the 4 through 8 years, the
6 8th through 14th year is 200, and the 14th year and
7 beyond, which is 2018 and beyond, is 175, so --

8 LYNN MOORER: We just started pumping that
9 well, didn't we? It's not been in service that
10 long, right?

11 BRADY BIGELOW: That's right.

12 LYNN MOORER: Okay. So if you could just
13 give the two answers: What -- because you said
14 right here, EW-12 is extracting more water than it
15 was originally expected.

16 BRADY BIGELOW: It can, yes.

17 LYNN MOORER: Well, all I'm asking for is
18 what did you project and what's the actual?

19 BRADY BIGELOW: Right now we're right at
20 the design rate.

21 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: How much is that?

22 LYNN MOORER: Okay. And how much did you
23 project?

24 BRADY BIGELOW: Three twenty-five.

25 LYNN MOORER: How much did you project?

1 BRADY BIGELOW: Well, we didn't really
2 project anything. Until you put a well in you don't
3 actually know what it'll produce, is that what
4 you're asking?

5 LYNN MOORER: Well, I'm just simply trying
6 to get the difference.

7 BRADY BIGELOW: Design rate --

8 LYNN MOORER: What you're saying right
9 here, you're pumping more than was originally
10 expected, so how much did you originally expect?

11 BRADY BIGELOW: Design rate for the
12 325 for the first few years.

13 LYNN MOORER: So at least it appears that
14 the statement isn't actually true.

15 BRADY BIGELOW: There is primary --

16 LYNN MOORER: You're pumping at the level
17 that you expected to pump at; is that the more
18 correct statement?

19 BRADY BIGELOW: Yeah, there's a primary
20 operating condition and a secondary operating
21 condition, and it's -- you got to look at the
22 design, you know, because you want to -- you want to
23 size the pump and motor so it runs most efficiently
24 or uses a lot of electricity and a lot of other
25 issues, but you --

1 But the long term -- I guess I'm not
2 quite -- yes, we're running right at the design.
3 During the start-up phases we pegged it right at the
4 design rate. Can it produce more water, yes.

5 GARTH ANDERSON: This is a good thing.

6 BRADY BIGELOW: Yeah.

7 GARTH ANDERSON: I'd like to answer
8 another question the Dave McReynolds asked about
9 Monitoring Well 85. Since November of 2004 -- well,
10 actually since March of 2005 I should say because
11 November is when we had the high hit.

12 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: No, it was 2/26/05 --
13 okay, it was November, but --

14 GARTH ANDERSON: Right, it was November
15 of --

16 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: (Inaudible comment)
17 2/26/05.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Right, but since then the
19 levels in March, June, and November of '05 have all
20 been consistently between 1 and 1.4.

21 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Now, okay, is that at
22 one level?

23 GARTH ANDERSON: That's for two levels, A
24 and B.

25 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: A and B are both -- have

1 both been running 1.4?

2 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

3 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Never higher than that?

4 GARTH ANDERSON: 1.4 is the highest level

5 we've seen.

6 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: That's five times the

7 limit.

8 GARTH ANDERSON: Actually the -- for RDX

9 the limit is two, so we're running about -- we're

10 running under that. Here's the -- here it is right

11 now.

12 DAVE MCREYNOLDS: Thank you.

13 LINDA WAGEMAN: Garth, this is Linda.

14 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

15 LINDA WAGEMAN: Getting back to what you

16 were talking about before and the mid-mile buffer

17 testing --

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Right, the half-mile

19 line, yes.

20 LINDA WAGEMAN: Yeah, could you show me on

21 the map just kind of where you're going to be

22 incorporating that testing?

23 GARTH ANDERSON: Yeah, actually the back

24 map shows it much better, but I'll try to do it up

25 here. We have an exact line on those back maps, but

1 if -- here's the one mile, here's the edge of the
2 plume.

3 LINDA WAGEMAN: Right.

4 GARTH ANDERSON: The one-mile line.

5 LINDA WAGEMAN: Right.

6 GARTH ANDERSON: So just basically halfway
7 between the two.

8 LINDA WAGEMAN: So are you going to go
9 above the NRD reservoir or are you going to start
10 below the NRD reservoir?

11 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, the NRD reservoir
12 is within a half mile of the edge of the plume.

13 LINDA WAGEMAN: Well, I'm trying to figure
14 out exactly how far north you intend to go in the
15 test.

16 GARTH ANDERSON: (Indicating.)

17 LINDA WAGEMAN: Oh, you're going to go all
18 the way to the tippy-top.

19 GARTH ANDERSON: Yeah, we have wells -- we
20 have wells within that, at like 80 and 82.

21 LINDA WAGEMAN: Then you're going to take
22 it all the way south? I'm following your finger.

23 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

24 LINDA WAGEMAN: Oh, okay, excellent, thank
25 you.

1 GARTH ANDERSON: You're welcome.

2 Okay. Great questions, we appreciate it,
3 we like talking about the data. Again, just want to
4 offer, anybody wants to stick around, we got maps,
5 we're ready to talk even further.

6 Yes, another question, Lorus.

7 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: This is not a
8 question.

9 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay.

10 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: I'm going to stand up,
11 I was wrong. We were talking about perchlorate at
12 the last meeting, I said it was in all four load
13 lines; that is not true. I don't think, we don't
14 for sure because it has never been tested; is that
15 correct?

16 GARTH ANDERSON: There has -- EPA did some
17 testing I think around 2003, but EPA has since --
18 they've gone out in the course of our sampling and
19 personnel from EPA had gone out and taken what we
20 call split samples to run at their own laboratory
21 for perchlorates.

22 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Okay. Well, I just
23 want everybody to know I didn't intentionally try to
24 mislead you. It was PCBs that was found in all four
25 load lines, and I did remember reading that out of a

1 document.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay. Well, thank you.

3 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: We do need to pay

4 attention to the percolate.

5 SCOTT MARQUESS: Let me just follow-up.

6 GARTH ANDERSON: Just one thing about

7 PCBs. PCBs are generally associated with electrical

8 transformers, it's a nonflammable oil that would go

9 in a transformer.

10 SCOTT MARQUESS: On the split sampling

11 Garth referenced, we took -- EPA collected samples

12 from several monitoring well clusters, and I'll give

13 you the numbers, let's see 21 -- these are

14 monitoring wells, 21A, B, D; 24A and B.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: There's 21.

16 SCOTT MARQUESS: 24. They're kind of a

17 random order here.

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Had to do with when we

19 installed them not, necessarily any kind of logical

20 pattern, so what was the next one, Scott?

21 SCOTT MARQUESS: 21, then 24, 24 --

22 LISA THOLL: About southeast of 31.

23 GARTH ANDERSON: Right there is 24.

24 SCOTT MARQUESS: 31, which I think is over

25 in the --

1 GARTH ANDERSON: 31, 32, 32.

2 NEW SPEAKER: Bingo.

3 SCOTT MARQUESS: 34.

4 GARTH ANDERSON: Just shout it out when
5 you got it, that's right. 34, MW-34.

6 SCOTT MARQUESS: 43.

7 GARTH ANDERSON: And here's 43.

8 SCOTT MARQUESS: Then I think we also --
9 we sampled the treatment plant effluents. This was for
10 perchlorate and Dioxane, Dioxane A and E analysis.
11 We also sampled Johnson Creek and the treatment
12 plants, both the new treatment plant and the
13 existing treatment plant, so I would anticipate that
14 data will be available within a month or so.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks, Scott.

16 LYNN MOORER: I have a more general
17 question --

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Okay, you bet.

19 LYNN MOORER: -- or shall we say it's kind
20 of a different topic.

21 MUD has what they call their 404 permit
22 status sheet now on their web site, and at the
23 special RAB meeting two weeks ago somebody from the
24 Corps, I don't remember who, perhaps you,
25 Mr. Anderson, said that this was something that had

1 been -- or maybe it was Mr. Leibbert, said that it
2 had been vetted by the Omaha district; that is, the
3 document had been prepared by MUD, and then vetted
4 by the Omaha district.

5 And so I want to read you something here.
6 This is what it says on -- this is MUD's take on
7 their status of compliance with Condition No. 26,
8 which is under the area of natural resources and
9 mitigation.

10 And it says, both Kansas City and Omaha
11 districts of the Corps of Engineers have also
12 concluded that the baseline modeling, meaning MUD's
13 baseline modeling, which reflects pumping within
14 these restrictions, will not adversely impact
15 cleanup operations at the Mead NOP site.

16 Mr. Anderson, do you agree with that at
17 least with respect to -- from the Kansas City Corps?

18 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

19 LYNN MOORER: All right. Thank you.

20 And this evening we have heard
21 Mr. Anderson give us a couple of fairly strong
22 statements. You said earlier, we expect to know
23 very early in the process if the plume moves; you
24 also said we're pretty confident we know where it's
25 going.

1 Now, I contrast those statements to
2 something that's in a document that's dated
3 February 13, 2006, and this is a letter from Gene
4 Gunn at USEPA Region 7, and it's his memorialization
5 of a meeting that was held December 12th, 2005,
6 between the Kansas City Corps and DEQ and EPA
7 personnel, and it -- and one of the topics that was
8 discussed was the groundwater cleanup time frame.

9 And there has was discussion about how
10 specific a time frame would be, and so I want to
11 read from that portion. It says, the USACE, which
12 stands for the Corps, maintained that the ROD, the
13 record of decision, does not require groundwater
14 cleanup within a specified time frame, and that
15 cleanup within a specific time frame is not an
16 enforceable component of the ROD.

17 They say, they prefer that given the
18 uncertainty and fate and transport groundwater
19 modeling, they would prefer that the time to reach
20 groundwater cleanup be approached as a goal rather
21 than as an enforceable criteria.

22 Now, to me that seems to be quite a stark
23 contradiction. On the one hand you are saying that
24 you are confident that you know where this plume is
25 going, you'll know very early in the process where

1 it moves, yet you -- and you agree with MUD's
2 statement that their pumping is not going to
3 adversely impact the cleanup operations at the NOP
4 site, yet you are unwilling to agree to an
5 enforceable time limit or shall we say making the
6 cleanup time frame be an enforceable criteria that
7 you all have to adhere to.

8 To me, those two things don't compute at
9 all. You are relying upon what you say is the
10 uncertainty about fate and transport in groundwater
11 modeling. I would like you to explain that
12 contradiction, Mr. Anderson, because it certainly
13 appears that you're trying to speak out of both
14 sides of your mouth. Thank you.

15 GARTH ANDERSON: I disagree with that
16 because these are -- those are actually two
17 completely unrelated issues.

18 LYNN MOORER: Please explain.

19 GARTH ANDERSON: The meeting that we had
20 with EPA, that discussion would have been exactly
21 the same had there -- had MUD been pumping or not.

22 The question is, yes, there is uncertainty
23 in fate and transport modeling, and that's where
24 contamination actually goes, and the question at
25 hand was how long will it take -- through the

1 pumping that we're doing here, how long will it take
2 for this plume to eventually come down and finally
3 completely disappear through -- through the
4 operation of the extraction wells.

5 There's -- right now we're trying to get
6 a -- we're getting a better handle on the interior
7 of the plume now that we have containment fairly
8 well in place.

9 So we're looking -- the question is how --
10 given that the makeup of the plume, the composition
11 of this plume and these other plumes, how long does
12 it actually take for the -- for the contamination to
13 get drawn down through here and into the -- into the
14 extraction wells.

15 Now, that -- the fate and transport
16 modeling is not an exact science because there are a
17 lot of other factors. You can't just look at
18 hydraulics. Fate and transport of actual
19 contamination, there are other factors such as
20 dispersion, dilution, retard -- well, it's a factor
21 called retardation, it's kind of an unfortunate
22 term, but it's held up by the soil as it moves
23 through the -- you know, down the gradient toward
24 the extraction wells.

25 The -- so that question was just an

1 interpretation of the ROD, whether 130 years was an
2 enforceable number or a goal, and we're working
3 on -- on -- we're working on ways that will reduce
4 our anticipated restoration time of the plume.

5 Scott talked earlier about getting the
6 definition of the, you know, more concentrated parts
7 of the plume so we can attack those with some
8 focused extraction and thereby cutting the plume
9 into more manageable pieces, we can reduce the
10 restoration time.

11 Right now if you talk about the, you know,
12 MUD modeling, hydraulically we're seeing that there
13 is not a whole lot of -- or based on their modeling
14 that we've reviewed, that it really doesn't
15 influence the plume as we have it in place today.

16 So therefore our cleanup would continue as
17 it is, and it would really not be affected by the
18 MUD pumping, so those are two completely independent
19 questions.

20 LYNN MOORER: Thank you for the
21 clarification. One follow-up question.

22 This letter from Mr. Gunn also notes that
23 Title 118, which is a part of the Nebraska
24 regulations, indicates a 20-year period is a
25 reasonable time frame for completing groundwater

1 cleanup.

2 Twenty years, and the lowest so far that
3 you all have been projecting is about a hundred and
4 thirty, and some of your estimates have said six
5 hundred and fifty years to clean it all up.

6 So I see that as a very, very large gap
7 between 20 years that DEQ is suggesting as a
8 reasonable time frame; have you all agreed that the
9 OU2 ROD should be reopened in order to specify a
10 20-year time frame for cleanup?

11 GARTH ANDERSON: No.

12 LYNN MOORER: What is -- what is your
13 response to DEQ's regulatory authority with respect
14 to this 20-year period that they think is the
15 reasonable time frame?

16 GARTH ANDERSON: Technically unfeasible.

17 LYNN MOORER: And --

18 GARTH ANDERSON: I wish --

19 LYNN MOORER: I'm sorry.

20 GARTH ANDERSON: And DEQ acknowledges the
21 technical infeasibility of the 20-year. The
22 20 years is really based on sites that are nowhere
23 near this magnitude. This is 11 square miles, and
24 just the travel time of water from here to here is
25 greater than 20 years, so --

1 LYNN MOORER: Okay. Mr. Marquess, I
2 noticed that this letter also says, EPA also noted
3 that the groundwater cleanup ultimately must occur
4 in a time frame consistent with the OU2 ROD, the NCP
5 and Nebraska Title 118, which is the one I just
6 mentioned, so that does seem to me to be a gap there
7 with respect to what Title 118 requires and what the
8 Corps says it will do or what his -- what its
9 position is at this time.

10 SCOTT MARQUESS: Well, I'm not going to
11 try and interpret Title 118 tonight. I can tell you
12 what is going to happen in terms of the site
13 management plan as far as the cleanup.

14 I don't know, Alyse, did you want to talk
15 to Title 118?

16 ALYSE STOY: Yeah, I can.

17 Hi, I'm Alyse Stoy, and I'm an attorney
18 now working on the project with the EPA.

19 Maybe I can talk just generally a little
20 bit about how we identify what we call ARARs and
21 those are state and local requirements that are
22 applicable to any superfund cleanup.

23 We're required by federal law to ensure
24 that superfund cleanup like this one achieve not
25 only what the federal requirements are out there,

1 but the state has enacted its own rules and
2 requirements for cleanup goals.

3 We do a lot of groundwater cleanup in the
4 state of Nebraska, and Title 118 is universally--an
5 ARAR established that on every single one of them,
6 at least the ones I work on.

7 You're right, ideally a 20-year time frame
8 is what is stated in Title 118, but it also says --
9 I don't have it in front of me, but it does have
10 the -- or whatever reasonable time frame it is, and
11 in this type of site it's a very large, complex
12 site.

13 So when Scott and myself, as the attorney,
14 we look to see what is an enforceable time frame
15 here. The technical part has to come into play to
16 figure out what is -- what -- just as Garth just
17 said, what is technically feasible in order to
18 achieve a cleanup goal. In this case, the goal is
19 to achieve MCLs.

20 So in this instance, the ROD -- the
21 1997 ROD certainly identified a much longer time
22 frame, and we do have other cleanups where we, in
23 order to achieve a clean up, have to go and look to
24 beyond a 20-year time frame.

25 But what Scott has been working with the

1 Corps on for some time is to figure out what is the
2 combination of what is technically feasible combined
3 with how do we get the cleanup achieved in-- as
4 quick as possible, as a nontechnical term.

5 I mean, it's in everybody's interest to
6 make sure that this system is not only contained,
7 but it's restored, given just the impact it has
8 already caused and the concerns that you all have
9 about the MUD pumping wells.

10 So I don't know if that helps to answer
11 just the general question. Part of this site
12 management plan that the Corps has been working on,
13 we've been working to try to identify what's a
14 reasonable approach to identifying how do we answer
15 this question of what is a reasonable time frame
16 combining the technical practicability, we have to
17 look at the cost, and, again, what -- what's
18 achievable and a time frame that is protective.

19 GARTH ANDERSON: Our goal is always to
20 reduce the restoration time whatever way we can
21 that's feasible. Larry?

22 LARRY ANGLE: Larry Angle, North Platte
23 North NRD.

24 About ten years ago we discussed this in
25 detail with the Corps. They had two plans: One was

1 kind of just a hundred-year treatment as you go, if
2 you will, letting the contaminant flow to the
3 remediation wells, and the other plan that was
4 discussed at that time was more of a 50-year
5 cleanup.

6 That was going to cause more pumping wells
7 to be installed, and the NRD and some of the area
8 farmers were concerned about the declining
9 groundwater levels, and what that would do to the
10 aquifer.

11 And so we were basically questioning that
12 and were reluctant to go with that 50-year cleanup
13 goal, and the Corps, they agreed with us and they
14 backed off to the hundred, so that's where we are
15 today. It can be done in 50 I believe, but, again,
16 you would decline the groundwater significantly if
17 you did that.

18 SCOTT MARQUESS: Just one point, the site
19 management plan approaches the groundwater cleanup,
20 it's got a four-phased approach, so we're going to
21 look at each one of the plumes at a time.

22 You know, what you've heard a little bit
23 about tonight is the sampling at the easternmost
24 plume, getting a lot of good data, finding out what
25 the hot spot is, and the next steps will be, all

1 right, well, okay, we see where the hot spot is,
2 what's -- how much is it going to cost to clean it
3 up and how much time.

4 So if we spent a million dollars we can
5 clean up that -- this -- this plume, million dollars
6 we can clean it up in 200 years, \$10 million we
7 clean it up in a 50 years, you know, \$100 million we
8 clean it up in two months.

9 So that's -- and so when we get -- that'll
10 be based on the additional data that's going to be
11 collected, additional groundwater modeling that'll
12 be based on this new data, and then a feasibility
13 study to look at how -- you know, once we define the
14 problem, what's the solution and how much is it
15 going to cost.

16 So there'll be a range -- stop me -- this
17 is what we've agreed to; there'll be a range going
18 from low cost, less aggressive plume cleanup to high
19 cost, more aggressive quicker cleanup, and we're
20 going to look at that and see if we can come up
21 with -- we can reach agreement as to what we're
22 going to implement here, and that'll be something
23 that'll occur east plume, next eastern, further west
24 and finally Load Line 1 plume.

25 And when we get to that point that'll all

1 be briefed here and everybody will have an
2 understanding of what's going on and then what the
3 remedy that's going to be selected, what's going --
4 you know, what that's going to consist of.

5 So that's the plan for moving forward in
6 terms of getting a better handle on restoration time
7 frame.

8 GARTH ANDERSON: And the good thing is
9 this can all be done within the context of the
10 current ROD because it does allow for focused
11 extraction technologies, which is really the leading
12 technology that we'd be looking at right now.

13 LYNN MOORER: I appreciate the
14 explanation. I should note though it does say in
15 this letter, which is, again, the Gene Gunn letter
16 dated February 13, 2006, it says, it is understood
17 that some type of modification of the OU2 ROD may be
18 necessary depending on the outcome of future work.

19 What you're telling us, Mr. Anderson, is
20 no?

21 GARTH ANDERSON: What I'm telling you is
22 that right now it looks like everything can be done
23 in the context of the ROD.

24 LYNN MOORER: But it is still possible
25 that it may need to be reopened?

1 GARTH ANDERSON: The process allows for
2 RODs to be modified if the circumstances warrant.
3 The national contingency plan, the CERCLA process
4 allows for that.

5 Okay. Looks like that's all the questions
6 on the data. We whipped through it tonight. We
7 appreciate -- I think everyone wants to get home
8 and -- because of the bad weather.

9 Future RAB topics, again, give the people
10 what they want. This isn't show business, I know
11 this hasn't been very entertaining tonight, but
12 we're interested in topics that you want to hear at
13 each and every RAB.

14 Right now we have a tentative date
15 established for July 13th, which is our normal
16 three-month cycle. One of the -- one of the topics
17 that we've agreed every time to talk about is our
18 quarterly monitoring, so at the July meeting we'll
19 be talking about the sampling that we're doing right
20 now.

21 And if there are other topics, feel free
22 to e-mail me, my e-mail address is at the end of
23 this, I'll give my card to whomever wants it, you
24 know, I like to find out what's really -- what
25 you're really interested in.

1 SCOTT MARQUESS: Comment.

2 GARTH ANDERSON: Let me back up, can you
3 back up a slide?

4 Some good news tonight, a community member
5 came to the open house tonight because he couldn't
6 make it to the RAB meeting, and he asked to actually
7 join the RAB, the former RAB, Mr. Paul Randazzo, so
8 we're happy to have him on board.

9 He submitted his interest form and we --
10 you know, we'd like to welcome him onto the RAB and
11 his participation and input into the process.

12 And if anybody else is interested in
13 actually joining the RAB, the board itself, we
14 have -- we do have some forms back there.

15 I apologize, there's a handwritten
16 strike-through on there so we can actually say it's
17 the Mead site, but Paul surprised us tonight by
18 wanting to join, so I said, well, heck, I better
19 make up some forms in case anybody else wants to
20 join.

21 So that's good news. It's good to get the
22 community involved in the actual RAB itself
23 formally.

24 Slide.

25 One thing that we're going to do in

1 addition to the RAB this summer, is we've had a lot
2 of folks that have been very interested in actually
3 touring the site because we have -- we're always
4 proud to show off our treatment plant, our treatment
5 building.

6 It's pretty impressive when you see the
7 guys from ECC, our operating contractors, working
8 that thing, it's quite a sight to behold. It's high
9 tech, it operates at a greater operational rate than
10 just about any site in the country.

11 We'll put it up against just about
12 anyplace else, and I think a lot of people are
13 interested in looking at what we put in down at the
14 end of Load Line 1, the new air stripper and the
15 extraction wells.

16 And, of course, it'll be a lot of fun,
17 little bus tour around so you can get an idea of the
18 magnitude of the plume, go around and look at the
19 perimeter.

20 So we'll announce a date of that -- that
21 site tour. Again, this is not a RAB meeting, this
22 is just a site tour that people have expressed
23 interest in having.

24 MELISSA KONECKY: Garth, are you -- are
25 you saying that in order to be an official RAB

1 member people have to, like, express an interest
2 or --

3 LINDA WAGEMAN: Can you repeat the
4 question, Melissa, I couldn't hear you?

5 MELISSA KONECKY: I just wondered if in
6 order for you guys to consider these community
7 members a RAB member, do they have to proactively
8 ask to be on the RAB?

9 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

10 MELISSA KONECKY: So in other words,
11 Lorus, as he sits here, and Nadeen and Victor are
12 not RAB members?

13 GARTH ANDERSON: That's correct. We would
14 certainly welcome their participation as official
15 RAB members if you'd like to fill out an interest
16 form, and -- so we can designate you as official
17 members of the board, certainly.

18 MELISSA KONECKY: You know, I can't
19 remember filling out an interest form.

20 GARTH ANDERSON: You did. 1997, everyone
21 that submitted an interest form in 1997 when we
22 formed the RAB was invited to join, and we welcomed
23 you and Kay Moline and Ross Rasmussen and several
24 others onto the board, and in about 1998 I believe
25 Kay had to resign as the co-chair because of other

1 duties, and the board elected you as the co-chair.

2 MELISSA KONECKY: Well, actually, you
3 know, I guess, you know, what I was thinking was
4 that, you know, a lot of people have put a lot of
5 work into this -- into this stuff and have done a
6 lot of, you know, searching through files and
7 everything, and it just seems like a slap in the
8 face for them to say, you know, they're not RAB
9 members.

10 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, they certainly can
11 be RAB members. Let's give them credit where credit
12 is due, and they could fill out the interest form or
13 talk to me and we'll see about having you officially
14 designated as a RAB member.

15 LYNN MOORER: Mr. Anderson.

16 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

17 LYNN MOORER: I think it might just be
18 helpful to note that a lot of people feel that you
19 play fast and loose with the rules, so to speak,
20 when it comes to the RAB people.

21 On the one hand, you have a lot of people
22 that have been giving their heart and soul for this
23 for a long time, and coming to meetings very
24 regularly and very faithfully working on this, and
25 you say, no, you're not a RAB member.

1 Yet when it comes to what the RAB Guidance
2 actually calls for in terms of how you designate
3 what's a RAB member, what you're doing here with the
4 interest forms isn't what RAB Guidance says the way
5 the RAB members are to be chosen.

6 So it's kind of like you -- and at one
7 meeting you try to impose unilateral rules on the
8 way things are going to run, but that's not what the
9 RAB has decided.

10 So we just ask that you respectfully --
11 that you respect the people in the community and
12 recognize that anybody who comes to this meeting has
13 a right to have all their questions answered, and
14 there should not be a distinction as to either you
15 are an anointed RAB member or not. Everybody has the
16 right to have the information.

17 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, unfortunately RAB
18 business is not a topic for the agenda tonight, but
19 I would love at some point to be able to discuss RAB
20 business and go over the RAB Guidance so people
21 understand what the duties of a RAB member are and
22 what's expected.

23 The interest form is actually taken right
24 out of the RAB Guidance; I pulled it right out of
25 the guidance and --

1 LYNN MOORER: Current RAB Guidance doesn't
2 quite provide for it, but there is no reason --

3 GARTH ANDERSON: I can understand your
4 point.

5 LYNN MOORER: I'm not sure you understand
6 the point. The thing of it is is that we would like
7 you to be consistent and fair with the community,
8 that's the point.

9 GARTH ANDERSON: Absolutely, and even the
10 community members that are not official RAB members
11 still have a right to come to a RAB meeting and ask
12 questions; there's no question about that. That's
13 always been in the guidance, always will be in the
14 guidance.

15 Yes, Lorus.

16 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: On your water model,
17 you have experts in Omaha that can read a water
18 model, correct?

19 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

20 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Or build a water
21 model?

22 GARTH ANDERSON: Yes.

23 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: They can build one?

24 GARTH ANDERSON: If you ask them they
25 would certainly do that.

1 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: So there's no problem
2 here, you got a lot of information, if we say we
3 want a three-layer water model here, you could
4 build -- they could build it for us?

5 GARTH ANDERSON: Sure, if that's --

6 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Thank you, I'm glad to
7 hear that.

8 GARTH ANDERSON: You can create a water
9 model however -- you know, whatever your
10 requirements are, you can make it. Is it the right
11 model? Don't know.

12 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Let's put in all the
13 information you have right now and let's make a
14 three-layer water model, and let's run some water
15 models when the Platte River is almost dry.

16 GARTH ANDERSON: Whose model are you
17 talking about first of all?

18 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: You just told me you
19 can run a water model.

20 GARTH ANDERSON: That was a rhetorical
21 question. Yes, people can build a three-dimensional
22 water model.

23 You're talking about our water model that
24 we use to manage the site or are you talking about
25 MUD's groundwater model?

1 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: I don't really see
2 myself that there's a whole heel of a lot of difference.

3 GARTH ANDERSON: Well, they are two
4 separate models for two different purposes, although
5 they're looking at a problem from different sides.

6 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: You just told me that
7 they could do it though.

8 GARTH ANDERSON: Anything is possible.

9 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: You understand me.

10 GARTH ANDERSON: I understand the
11 question. You can build a model however you want to
12 build it; whether you need to or not is another
13 question.

14 LORUS LUETKENHAUS: Well, we need to.
15 Let's build a water model between the plume and
16 their well field and let's have a draw-down map
17 showing when they're pumping 104 million gallons a
18 day, which they're permitted to, when there is low
19 flow in the river, when there's no flow in the
20 river, after 30 days of no flow, and after 60 days
21 of no flow, which they are permitted to do, and then
22 let's see what we come up with.

23 GARTH ANDERSON: We'll take that comment
24 back, not going to say that they're going to do it
25 or not do it, but we'll certainly bring that up in

1 our next discussion.

2 Okay. Five-minute break, change the tape.

3 (9:02 p.m. - Recess taken.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (At 9:10 p.m., with parties present as
2 before, the following proceedings were had, to-wit:)

3 GARTH ANDERSON: We'll go ahead and wrap
4 it up.

5 We came real close to having enough tape
6 to almost complete the meeting, but we've changed
7 the tape. We're at the point of any last questions,
8 or if anybody has given any thought to any topics
9 for the next RAB meeting.

10 Yes, Mr. O'Hara.

11 MR. O'HARA: Do you want to point out the
12 numbers has changed so if people have difficulty contacting --

13 GARTH ANDERSON: That's a good point.

14 Like every good business or every
15 government agency occasionally needs to change its
16 phone numbers, so ours is no exception, so any
17 numbers that you have for the Corps of Engineers
18 that has a prefix of 983 should now be 389.

19 It had nothing to do with our dyslexia and
20 reading the numbers backwards, but, yeah, if you --
21 I think I've sent it to everybody that's on my
22 e-mail list that it's a 389 number, but just be
23 aware.

24 LARRY ANGLE: It's on your sheet.

25 GARTH ANDERSON: Yeah, it's also on my

1 sheet. Mary Lyle had to go. Her -- there it is, so
2 389-3255, feel free to call me anytime, and there's
3 my e-mail address. I'm always near my computer, so
4 if you have any questions for me please feel free to
5 e-mail me.

6 And I'd love to get you on my e-mail list
7 so that I can send out notices and documents as
8 we -- as they become final.

9 Okay. That looks like a wrap. Thanks for
10 coming. I hope everyone's house weathered the storm
11 okay and that there's no damage out there.

12 See everybody on July 13th, for the next
13 RAB meeting, and I will announce the date of the
14 site tour in June. Thank you.

15 (9:15 p.m. - Adjournment.)

16 ** ** ** ** **

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25